



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,522	03/04/2002	Robert S. Block	033401-001	1099

7590 04/23/2004

Frederick G. Michaud, Jr.
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

COBY, FRANTZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7

24

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/086,522

Applicant(s)

BLOCK ET AL.

Examiner

Frantz Coby

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 45-70 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-5</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

This is in response to Applicant's reply to a restriction requirement in which claims 1-44 were elected for prosecution on the merits.

Unresolved Issues

On the restriction dated February 23, 2004, three groups of invention were indicated. In response to the restriction of the aforementioned date, the Applicant elected Group I without traverse. Therefore, a decision should be made as to whether groups II and III should be withdrawn from further consideration. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by
Hausman et al. U.S. Publication 2003/0126056 A1.

As per claims 1-9, Hausman et al. disclose a method for organizing data, the method comprising the steps of capturing a data stream; identifying data in the captured data stream"; "mapping the identified data to at least one of a file structure, a schema,

and a taxonomy” by providing a computer network for distributing and mapping of financial records from data stream (See Hausman et al. Title; Abstract). In addition, Hausman et al. provide multiple computers to identify data in the captured data stream (figure 1a, components 106-107); multiple caches for storing the captured data (figure 1a, components 110); mechanism for identifying values in a first or second currency based on a conversion factor (See Hausman et al. Pages 4-5, Sections 0038-0039; Figure 3 and corresponding text).

Claims 1-4, 13-15 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hamlin et al. U.S. Patent no. 6,615,312.

As per claim 1, Hamlin et al. disclose “a method for organizing data, the method comprising the steps of capturing a data stream; identifying data in the captured data stream” by providing a method for processing file system service requests in a computer having an attached disk drive that can reproduced stream data and non-stream data (See Hamlin et al. Title; Col. 2, lines 40-56; Col. 8, lines 14-25; Col. 12, line 57-67). The Applicant should duly note that during operations such as read and write, stream data are captured (Col. 12, lines 9-12). The file system service requests include a stream system identifier where captured data streams are identified (See Col. 12, lines 57-58). In particular, Hamlin et al. disclose the claimed feature of “mapping the identified data to at least one of a file structure, a schema, and a taxonomy” by providing a mechanism for mapping that maps addressable locations of a disk drive into a physical space where

the step of mapping uses logical block addressed obtained from a file allocation structure of a file system and content of a record which identifies whether a file service is for stream data (See Hamlin et al. Figure 3, Col. 12, line 43-67).

As per claims 2 and 4, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Hamlin et al. disclose the claimed limitations of "capturing and identifying are performed by different computers or at different locations". Hamlin et al. achieved these claimed features during operations such as read and write, stream data are captured (Col. 12, lines 9-12) from the disk drive 114 of figure 1 and when the file system service requests include a stream system identifier where captured data streams are identified (See Col. 12, lines 57-58) through application programs 102.

As per claim 3, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Hamlin et al. disclose the claimed limitations of storing the captured data stream (See Hamlin et al. Col. 12, line 43-67) wherein the identifying is performed on the stored data stream.

As per claims 13-15, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Hamlin et al. disclose the claimed limitations of "maps the identified data to a flat file; outputting a data definition that defines a structure

Art Unit: 2171

of the flat file; wherein the structure indicates locations of the mapped data within the flat file" as shown in Figures 2-3; Col. 7, line 55-Col. 12, line 40.

As per claims 17-21, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Hamlin et al. disclose the claimed limitations of data stream in the form of a data output to a computer data port, in the form of a data output to a data storage device; wherein the storage device is a Random Access Memory in a computer; wherein the data storage device is a disk drive; wherein the data stream is generated at an Operating System level of a computer implementing the method (See Hamlin et al. Figures 1-3 and corresponding text).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8, 10-12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamlin et al. U.S. Patent 6,615,312 in view of Darugar U.S. Publication 2003/0018661 A1.

As per claims 8 and 10, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1.

It is noted, however, Hamlin et al. did not specifically detail the aspect of mapping identified data to an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) taxonomy as recited in the instant claim wherein the identified data are organized in accordance with a first standard; and the step of mapping comprises the identified data in accordance with a second standard. On the other hand, Darugar provides an XML smart mapping system and method that achieved the aforementioned claimed features by mapping elements from a first XML format to a second XML format using an interface that allows a user to associate elements from the first format to the second format.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the file service request system of Hamlin et al. by incorporating the XML smart mapping mechanism provided by Darugar into the mapping system of Hamlin et al. because that would enhance the versatility of Hamlin et al. system by allowing it to map stream data to a file structure more efficiently. Also because that will permit a map component and the functionality associated with it to facilitate the conversion of an input document having a given XML format to another XML document having a different XML format without requiring the user to use sophisticated high or low level programming languages to develop code to perform the mapping (See Darugar Page 1, Section 0007).

As per claim 11-12, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1.

It is noted, however, Hamlin et al. did not specifically detail the aspect of mapping identified data into a spreadsheet or into a database. On the other hand, Darugar provides an XML smart mapping system and method that achieved the aforementioned claimed feature by mapping elements from a first XML format to a second XML format using an interface that allows a user to associate elements from the first format to the second format. Also, Darugar provides a system that can interface to a variety of different databases including spreadsheets (See Darugar Page 1, Section 0010).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the file service request system of Hamlin et al. by incorporating the XML smart mapping mechanism provided by Darugar into the mapping system of Hamlin et al. because that would enhance the versatility of Hamlin et al. system by allowing it to map stream data to a file structure more efficiently. Also because that will permit a map component and the functionality associated with it to facilitate the conversion of an input document having a given XML format to another XML document having a different XML format without requiring the user to use sophisticated high or low level programming languages to develop code to perform the mapping (See Darugar Page 1, Section 0007).

As per claim 16, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1.

It is noted, however, Hamlin et al. did not specifically detail the aspect of "wherein the data stream is in the form of data output to a computer display screen". On the other hand, Darugar provides an XML smart mapping system and method that achieved

Art Unit: 2171

the aforementioned claimed feature by mapping elements from a first XML format to a second XML format using an interface that allows a user to associate elements from the first format to the second format. Also, Darugar provides a system where the data stream is in the form of a data output to a computer display screen (See Darugar figure 1 and corresponding text).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the file service request system of Hamlin et al. by incorporating the XML smart mapping mechanism provided by Darugar into the mapping system of Hamlin et al. because that would enhance the versatility of Hamlin et al. system by allowing it to map stream data to a file structure more efficiently. Also because that will permit a map component and the functionality associated with it to facilitate the conversion of an input document having a given XML format to another XML document having a different XML format without requiring the user to use sophisticated high or low level programming languages to develop code to perform the mapping (See Darugar Page 1, Section 0007).

Claims 22-32 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamlin et al. U.S. Patent 6,615,312 in view of Zbikowski et al. U.S. Patent no. 5,758,360.

As per claim 22, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1.

Art Unit: 2171

It is noted, however, Hamlin et al. did not specifically detail the aspect of "identifying metadata in the data stream and selecting labels that correspond to the identified metadata, based on a list associating labels with metadata" as recited in the instant claim. On the other hand, Zbikowski et al. achieved the claimed features by providing a meta-data structure and handling that stored metadata in the disk storage in a second variable sized stream data structure (See Zbikowski et al. Col. 1, lines 50-Col. 2, line 34) where metadata is identified when a request to read the metadata from the disk storage is made.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the file service request system of Hamlin et al. by incorporating the metadata structure taught by Zbikowski et al. to allow both data and metadata to be stored as group of streams so that metadata can be identified in the data stream (See Zbikowski et al. Col. 3, lines 14-16).

As per claims 23-32, 40, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 22. In addition, Zbikowski et al. disclose the aspect of "selecting labels associating with metadata and creating a file by combining the selected labels" as well as metadata comprises at least one text string by providing "onode" which corresponds to object that holds all the streams that constitute a file (See Zbikowski et al. Col. 6, lines 1-13).

Claims 33-39 and 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamlin et al. U.S. Patent 6,615,312 in view of Zbikowski et al. U.S. Patent no. 5,758,360 as applied to the rejection of claims 22-32 and 40 and further in view of Darugar.

As per claims 33-39, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 22-32 and 40.

It is noted, however, neither Hamlin et al. nor Zbikowski et al. specifically detail languages to which the data streams are conforming. On the other hand, Darugar provides an environment to allow mapping of data stream conforming to the XML language (See Darugar Page 1, sections 0006-0010).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the file service request system of Hamlin et al. by incorporating the metadata structure taught by Zbikowski et al. to allow both data and metadata to be stored as group of streams so that metadata can be identified in the data stream (See Zbikowski et al. Col. 3, lines 14-16); and further modify the combination of Hamlin et al. and Zbikowski et al. by incorporating the mapping mechanism taught by Darugar into the combined mapping of Hamlin et al. and Zbikowski et al. for the purpose of providing an environment that conforms with different languages including XML. The motivation being to permit a map component and the functionality associated with it to facilitate the conversion of an input document having a given XML format to another XML document having a different XML format without requiring the user to use sophisticated high or low

level programming languages to develop code to perform the mapping (See Darugar Page 1, Section 0007).

As per claims 41-44, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 22-32 and 40. In addition, both Hamlin et al. and Zbikowski et al. provides mechanism for providing data stream from a target program to a transformation program; identifying and mapping; wherein the transformation program is independent from the target program; wherein the transformation program and the target program are modules; wherein the data stream is in a form of data output to a computer printer (See Hamlin et al. col. 2, line 40-Col. 3, line 53; See Zbikowski et al. Col. 1, line 51-Col. 2, line 34).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz Coby whose telephone number is 703 305-4006. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 10:30AM -10:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703 308 1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2171

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Frantz Coby
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2171

April 13, 2004